

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/998,599	11/16/2001	Shinji Uebayashi	15689.91	4705	
759	7590 04/25/2006			EXAMINER	
ADRIAN J. LEE WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY 1000 Eagle Gate Tower 60 East South Temple			SHAH, CH	SHAH, CHIRAG G	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2616		
Salt Lake City,	UT 84111		DATE MAILED: 04/25/2000	DATE MAILED: 04/25/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	(Appliant/a)			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/998,599	UEBAYASHI ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
·	Chirag G. Shah	2616			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 05 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP		•			
1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of					
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff dice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mi	fidavit, or other evidence, which compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later.					
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.			
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).					
AMENDMENTS	hara a dana a ahara da a a gerta a a hata g	91			
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 2-10,13 and 28-30. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 16-19,21 and 33. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		Il be entered and an explanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	All Comments of Charles	or and a second of the second of			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar. 10. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to date of filing entered by the state of the st	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails to provide a See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.			
1.	idered but does NOT place the app	olication in condition for allowance			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	Vo(s)			
13. Other:					
		PATENT EXAMINER, 261			
		•			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding claims 16 and 18 and respective dependents, Applicant argues that Hwang does not disclose the feature of claim 16 that information of a synchronization channel based on a TDD method is included in a signal based on an FDD method, and the signal based on the FDD method is transmitted. Examiner respectfully disagrees and redirects Applicant to the last limitation of claim 16. Applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., information channel based on a TDD method is included in a signal based on an FDD method and the signal based on the FDD method is transmitted) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In addition, based on the combination Schulz, discloses that a BS send information in a control signal to the respective radio interface based on FDD mode. Schulz respectfully already establishes that information of TDD mode may be included in a FDD mode. The basis of Hwang's reference is to establish that information of TDD mode includes synchronization channels such as SCCH, BCCH, PCCH and common control channel (CCCH). Regarding claim 21, Applicant argues that Akerberg does not disclose a timing offset between a signal based on a TDD method and a signal based on an FDD method. Once Again, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the position of the Applicant. Schulz respectfully already establishes that information of TDD mode may be included in a FDD mode. Akerberg establishes in figure 11 and in col. 8, lines 13-26 of a TDD/FDD system, where information relating to the timing offset based on the TDD and FDD method. The basis of Akerberg's reference is to establish that information of TDD mode includes timing offset. Based on above discussion, Examiner respectfully submits that claims 16-19, 21 and 33 remain unpatentable over the respective arts as discussed in the office action.